

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 143–144 and 146-147 are currently pending. Claims 143 and 146 are independent and are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 143 and 146 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,404,316 to Klingler et al. (hereinafter, merely “Klingler”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,683 to Corella et al. (hereinafter, merely “Corella”).

In view of the amendments herein, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 143 recites, *inter alia*:

“wherein a plurality of enable/disable flags corresponding to respective ones of the plurality of clips linked to the tree structure are reset at once in response to the modification of a single clip.”

As understood by the Applicants, Corella discloses a

“The control area also contains a "Modifications" field 2820, where a check mark is displayed if there have been modifications of the knowledge base since the last recalculation . . . The "Modifications" field 2820 reflects the state ("set" or "cleared") of a variable of the authoring program called the "Modifications" flag. The "Modifications" flag is set by the authoring system after each authoring step that changes a value, changes a formula, or creates a formula; it is cleared after each recalculation.” Col. 20, lines 22-27 and FIG. 28; similarly in col. 24, lines 41-46.

The “modifications” flag of Corella is a single flag. That is, the “modifications” flag of Corella is used to indicate whether there has been a modification anywhere in the knowledge base and, thus, only a single flag is necessary to alert an author using the knowledge base to a need for recalculation.

In contrast, claim 143 recites, “wherein a plurality of enable/disable flags corresponding to respective ones of the plurality of clips linked to the tree structure are reset at once in response to the modification of a single clip.” In the present application there is a plurality of enable/disable flags, each associated with a respective one of the plurality of clips and edit resultant clips. Modification of any one edit clip from the plurality of clips causes a plurality of the enable/disable flags to be re-set at the same time.

Thus, for clips in the tree structure, when the content of the edit processing of a clip is modified for example, the enable/disable flag of that resultant clip is set to disable. In the present invention, when a clip is modified the enable/disable flag is set to disable not only for the clip but also for the clips in the hierarchy that have the clip as a lower clip. Page 97, lines 3-18. Thus, the modification of a single clip in the hierarchy causes a resetting of multiple enable/disable flags of clips in the hierarchy.

The present application has an enable/disable flag associated with each clip in the hierarchical structure. An advantage of the present system is even if the content of the edit is changed after the edit work has been performed once, the associated clips can be changed automatically by the management of the hierarchical structure. The edit work can be more easily changed even if the operator does not intentionally remember the relation between clips. Furthermore, even if the edit content is changed, the original work data relating to the edit is remains to ease a return to the original state after the edit content has been changed. Further, the relation between clips is managed with the hierarchical structure, so that the edit work is successively performed based on the relation between clips managed with the hierarchical structure. Page 116, lines 1-18.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claim 146 is also believed to be patentable.

III. **DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The other claims are dependent from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 143-144 and 146-147 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited



PATENT
450108-4484.2

reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: _____

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800